

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 26-30 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-45 are submitted for reconsideration. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

The amendments to claims 26-30 are to correct the claim dependency.

In the Office Action, claims 1-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dusevic et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0055868) in view of Leisten et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,023,702). Claim 1 recites that a method for executing an application comprises, *inter alia*, identifying one or more rules applicable to the first application, executing one or more generic tasks stored in a first area accessible to all customers according to the identified one or more rules, and executing at least one customized task according to the identified one or more rules, the at least one customized task being stored in a second area accessible only to the first customer.

Dusevic discloses a task-centric online environment having a task 110 including one or more subtasks 112, which may be topics or outcomes within the task, where each subtask 112 including one or more task details 114, which may be associated with one or more content 116 documents (see [0050]). The task-centric online environment provides an interface that allows end users to choose among one or more areas of an industry, among one or more disciplines of an area, and/or among one or more work areas of a discipline (see [0057]).

To implement this task-centric online environment, categories (which include tasks 110, subtasks 112, and task details 114) are associated in a hierarchical manner with categories containing zero, one or more children categories and zero, one or more content documents (see [0058]). Categories can be associated with more than one parent category, a document can be associated with more than one category, and documents can be associated

with more than one parent document (see [0059] – [0061]). Further, documents and categories can be linked together or associated in an infinite number of ways to provide a user with many paths or plays to get to the same piece of information, where a play may be defined as a strategy used to solve a particular problem or perform a particular task in the task-centric online environment (see [0062]).

In the rejection, the Examiner asserted that paragraphs [0057] and [0065] – [0067] of Dusevic provide support for the recitations in claim 1 regarding executing generic tasks stored in an area accessible to all customers and executing at least one customized task stored in an area accessible only to a first customer. Paragraph [0057] described above does not disclose anything regarding generic tasks being accessible to all customers while at least one customized task is accessible only to a first customer. In fact, there is nothing in this paragraph that discloses or suggest anything about customized tasks at all. Rather, the task-centric online environment only has tasks 110, subtasks 112, and task details 114 that already exist, not ones that can be customized by a customer.

Paragraphs [0065] – [0067] similarly fail to disclose anything regarding generic tasks being accessible to all customers while at least one customized task is accessible only to a first customer, nor do they disclose anything about customized tasks. Paragraph [0065] discloses that the task-centric online environment may include sections concentrating on a particular discipline, such as geology, and the section may include description of plays and strategies, such as a play or strategy to create a basemap or to do velocity modeling. Paragraph [0066] discloses that the plays and solutions may be displayed in a hierarchical fashion. Paragraph [0067] discloses that, in contrast to prior art systems, it is possible to start from the level of a specific task (i.e., low level task) so that a user can start below the product or service level. In each of these cases, there is nothing in Dusevic that distinguishes between a generic task and a customized task nor anything about executing tasks available to all customers and at least one task available only to a first customer. Further, there is no other part of Dusevic that discloses or suggests executing generic tasks accessible to all customers and executing at least one customized task accessible only to a first customer.

Even if combinable, Leisten fails to cure the deficiencies of Dusevic. Like Dusevic, Leisten fails to disclose or suggest executing one or more generic tasks stored in a first area accessible to all customers and executing at least one customized task stored in a second area accessible only to the first customer, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the combination of Dusevic and Leisten.

Claims 2-4 are patentably distinguishable from the combination of Dusevic and Leisten by virtue of their dependence from claim 1, as well as their additional recitations. Claims 16-19 and 31-34 are also patentably distinguishable from the combination of Dusevic and Leisten for reasons analogous to claim 1.

Claim 5 recites that a method for developing an application comprises identifying one or more rules and one or more generic tasks corresponding to the identified one or more rules included in a first generic application, receiving a request to modify the first generic application into a first custom application, and generating at least one customized task based upon the received request. The method further comprises modifying at least one of the one or more identified rules to incorporate the at least one customized task into the first custom application, the first custom application including at least one of the one or more generic tasks included in the first generic application.

As the basis for the rejection of claim 5, the Examiner referred to Fig. 14 of Dusevic. As disclosed in paragraph [0348], Fig. 14 illustrates an exemplary macro tasks page 124 for the structural interpretation work area in a task-centric online environment directed towards geology and geophysical area of the oil and gas industry. In the example of Fig. 14, a high-level task 110 is selected to display subtasks 112 of the high-level task, and one of the subtasks 112 is selected to display the task details 114 of the selected subtask (see [0348]). Dusevic further discloses that a customer may use a subset of a vendor's products, such as one or more applications (see [0349]). If the subset of applications are not integrated, the macro tasks page 124 helps to define relationships between the applications (see [0349]).

To explain this concept, Dusevic provides an example using one application for interpreting seismic data and another application for interpreting well data (see [0350]).

When a particular subtask 112 is selected, task details 114 of the subtask are displayed in the page 124, and the task details 114 of the selected subtask 112 can be directed at the integrated use of the vendor's products (i.e., the applications for interpreting seismic data and interpreting well data) to perform the selected subtask 112 (see [0350]). Further, the task details 114 may show things the end user needs to do and not to do, as well as the consequences of not performing the tasks properly (see [0350]). Accordingly, Fig. 14 and the corresponding description of Dusevic disclose a system for providing guidance on how to work with two or more applications if they are not already integrated.

In contrast to claim 5, there is nothing in Fig. 14 or the corresponding disclosure of Dusevic that discloses or suggests receiving a request to modify a first generic application into a first custom application, and generating at least one customized task based upon the received request. Rather, as discussed above, the end user in Dusevic merely selects one or more existing applications to use, and one or more existing task details explain what the user needs to do to use the existing applications. However, Dusevic does not disclose or suggest that an existing application is modified into a custom application.

Furthermore, since Dusevic fails to disclose or suggest modifying an existing application into a custom application, Dusevic necessarily fails to disclose or suggest modifying at least one of the one or more identified rules to incorporate the at least one customized task into the first custom application, the first custom application including at least one of the one or more generic tasks included in the first generic application, as recited in claim 5.

Even if combinable, Leisten fails to cure the deficiencies of Dusevic. Like Dusevic, Leisten fails to disclose or suggest receiving a request to modify a first generic application into a first custom application, generating at least one customized task based upon the received request, and modifying at least one of the one or more identified rules to incorporate the at least one customized task into the first custom application, the first custom application including at least one of the one or more generic tasks included in the first generic application, as recited in claim 5. Accordingly, claim 5 is patentably distinguishable from the combination of Dusevic and Leisten.

Claims 6-15 are patentably distinguishable from the combination of Dusevic and Leisten by virtue of their dependence from claim 5, as well as their additional recitations. Claims 20-30 and 35-45 are also patentably distinguishable from the combination of Dusevic and Leisten for reasons analogous to claim 5.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 11/12/04

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,874